THEOLOGY

VOL. L APRIL, 1947 No. 322

Editorial

MR MONTGOMERY BELGION, who is well known to readers of THEOLOGY, has written an important little book on the Nuremberg Trial,[1] which we hope will be read and digested by the high ecclesiastics and others who gave the trial their blessing. Mr Belgion is not to be expected of a sentimental attitude towards the Germans, since he was for several years a prisoner-of-war in Germany. There is in fact no trace of sentimentality in his book; it consists of hard-headed argument from beginning to end. We do not find it equally convincing at every point, but, to say the least, it succeeds in showing that on moral, legal and political grounds the procedure that was adopted in dealing with "war criminals" is exposed to grave and decisive objections. The best answerable part of the argument is that which rests upon the fact that the powers that were responsible for instituting and conducting the proceedings were themselves, Russia most obviously, also responsible for committing "war crimes" of the same kind as those they were proceeding against. While we know that lawyers as well as ecclesiastics, and, of course, politicians, have defended the proceedings, we do not think good service is done to the fair name of justice or to the majesty of law by attempting to exhibit the Nuremberg Trial as an example of what justice and law mean or of what they promise to mean in the future.

* * * * *

A quite invaluable aid to the student of the Bible is now available in England in *The Westminster Historical Atlas to the Bible*.[2] It is the work of some leading American scholars, and was first produced in the U.S.A. It contains 33 maps in colour and 77 illustrations, and the letterpress supplies a large range of information which it is convenient to have at hand for reference. Full use has been made of the results of recent archæological research. The price is quite reasonable in view of the present costs of production. We strongly recommend the clergy, teachers of divinity, and biblical students generally, to procure a copy while it is in print.

* * * * *

There is a growing number of printed forms of instruction for, and of addresses to, those who are going to be married, and they are a welcome sign that more is being done by the Church in this direction. *Till Death Us Do Part*, by the Rev. Ronald Dix (Pax House, 2s. 6d.) is a series of letters for those engaged to be married. The instruction they

[1] *Epitaph on Nuremberg*. Falcon Press. 3s.
[2] Edited by G. Ernest Wright and Floyd V. Filson. S.C.M. Press. 25s.

contain is wise and wholesome, expressed on the whole in an attractive and intelligible manner, though the letters might with advantage have been more concise. They are dogmatic in both a good and a bad way. Mr Dix's parishioners and friends probably have small reason to accuse him of being woolly or of speaking with an uncertain voice. It is to be hoped however that they are not afraid to ask one who is confessedly writing for members of the Church of England to cite appropriate authority for some of his assertions. "Needless to say, the sacrament (*i.e.*, holy communion) is received fasting, as it always must be" (p. 49). "Go and make your confession to a priest. Being a good member of the Church of England you've probably made up your mind to do this, not just because of your wedding, but as a regular habit as the Church tells us to do and as I explained at your confirmation classes" (pp. 59*f.*). *For Better For Worse* (A.P.C.K., Dublin, 6d.) is designed for the same purpose as *Till Death Us Do Part*, but it has not the same personal touch and makes heavier reading. It is in the form of a careful exposition of the teaching of the marriage service, and the doctrine is unexceptionable. But it is too much like a minor treatise on holy matrimony. It lacks the note of personal address. And the vocabulary is unnecessarily difficult and abstract. For all we know, those who come to be married in the Church of Ireland may be more sophisticated than those who come to be married in the Church of England, but we doubt if "social significance," "elucidate," "conditioned," "systematized," etc., are terms that form part of their ordinary speech.

* * * * *

The Rev. E. Dudley Brown, of All Saints' Rectory, Beaconsfield, Kimberley, South Africa, writes to us as follows:

" In view of the difficulty of obtaining the later writings of William Law, those who, following the advice of the Bishop of Hereford in your January issue, wish to know something of them may like to know that there is in print a small booklet entitled *The Secret of Inspiration*, by Dr Andrew Murray, which consists almost entirely of lengthy quotations from Law's *Spirit of Love*, *Spirit of Prayer* and *Address to the Clergy*. It is published by Marshall, Morgan and Scott, Ltd, as one of a series of pocket volumes of Murray's works.

"Andrew Murray, sometimes called 'The Apostle of the Boers,' was a saintly and much-loved leader of the Dutch Reformed Church in South Africa in the latter half of the last century and the early years of this. In his later days he was profoundly influenced by Law and Behmen. His writings deserve to be far better known by Anglicans than they are."

* * * * *

The 1947 edition of *A Christian Year Book* (S.C.M. Press, 5s.) has been thoroughly revised and contains much additional material. It is a useful work of reference. We are glad to report the publication of a new and revised edition of *The Riddle of the New Testament*, by Sir Edwyn Hoskyns and Noel Davey (Faber, 8s. 6d.). The first edition was reviewed in October, 1931, by the Dean of Winchester.

Thinking Anew[1]

The title "Thinking Anew" is not meant to imply that the present has any new thoughts to offer, but simply to inquire whether our manner of thinking to-day, both in scientific and general subjects, is not taking a new direction. For there is such a direction in our thought, and we are, as it were, compelled to follow it, whatever may be the subject about which we are thinking. This direction depends in every epoch upon the view of reality held in that epoch. The view of reality is something different from the view of the universe. The view of the universe is the product of astronomical science. This can at times acquire such vitality as to become the self-evident presupposition of a series of concepts and ideas; this is what happened in the case of the Ptolemaic view of the universe, while the Copernican is still far from such an achievement. Our view of reality forms the primary foundation of all our concepts and ideas, and determines the direction of our thought. The view of reality is the scheme within which all the experiences of our life appear possible and intelligible. If experiences emerge at variance with our view of reality we must regard them as errors, illusions, *fallaciæ opticæ*—or else our view of reality is false and no longer adequate. An age in which a view of reality is thus refuted by its manifest inconsistency with experience is in the true sense of the word, an age of crisis. It would seem that such an age has long been upon us.

If we are to understand aright the view of reality, now challenged by such a crisis, we must picture to ourselves that which preceded it. If we look at medieval descriptions of the earth and of nature we cannot help noticing that they differ from the modern not so much in their positive results as in their fundamental method of approach. Take for instance the descriptions given in Sebastian Münster's *Cosmographia* of the fauna and flora of other lands and continents. He takes it quite for granted that foreign lands harbour foreign creatures. The reason for this differentiation lies for Sebastian Münster and his age not in the conditions of climate and vegetation which obtain in other lands, but solely in the will of God, the Creator. This does not mean that he denies himself a unifying and comprehensive view of things, but that he takes it for granted that unity and comprehensiveness are given only in the will of God. He would certainly have observed that giraffes, because of their peculiarities, would find life difficult in European latitudes. But such an observation, of which we may safely regard so practical and sensible an age as quite capable, was of no particular interest to it. In fact, they were not at all interested in the interconnexions of things as such, but they *were* interested in the fact that things were interconnected in the will of God and *sub specie æternitatis*, and in the way in which they were interconnected.

[1] This is the translation (by the Rev. J. N. Sanders and Erich Heller) of a paper read to a group of students in Hamburg before the opening of the University. It was—at the request of the students—printed in the first issue (1946/47) of the *Hamburger Akademische Rundschau*, a magazine published by teachers and undergraduates of Hamburg University.

As in nature, so in history. In previous ages history was presented in the form of annals and chronicles—*i.e.*, single events were reported without any interest being taken in the interconnexion of events with one another. An intelligible interconnexion of events only seemed possible as an interconnexion in the will of God. From this point of view it makes sense to write an historical work under the title *Gesta Dei per Francos*. This expresses not only the pride of the Franks but also the straightforward assertion that the interconnexion of all these events is only to be found in the will of God. Modern writers of history would regard all kinds of things as important, but it is quite certain that the will of God would not play the slightest part in their treatment of the subject. We would, *e.g.*, write a life of Bismarck in which all the documentary evidence was carefully collected and utilized. We would include the psychology of Bismarck, and perhaps would even add a lengthy chapter on Bismarck's religion. If a man with a view of the world peculiar to a previous age read such a biography he would certainly ask why anyone should go to such trouble to describe so trivial an existence, and what there was in such an existence that could properly be described as historical. He would say that everything in this life was merely human, and therefore could not be historical. The biographers of a previous age would surely have told of angels that guarded and devils that threatened their hero's life; miracles would have happened and the whole would have shone with the light of heaven or of hell. *Only in this way could a life become historical.* For history, at that time, dealt with the eternal aspect of things.

All this has been radically changed in the period which we to-day call the modern. The story is told of a conversation which Frederick the Great once had with Cardinal Lucchesini, in which the king remarked upon the different fauna and flora of different latitudes. But this observation is not for Frederick the Great—as it was for Sebastian Münster—an occasion for recognizing the richness of God's creative power. Instead, he uses it to cast doubt on the idea of creation altogether. For this variety is due, not to the will of God, but to the climate. The substitution of climate for God is the hallmark of the new view of reality.

In 1652 Bossuet published his *Discours sur l'histoire universelle*. He treats his subject, on the whole, in the spirit of the traditional view of reality—*i.e.*, in the spirit of the annals and chronicles. But in chapter two he says that "we shall only understand history properly if we learn to understand and deduce the particular events of an epoch from the context of that epoch itself." Here, then, it is the interconnexion of things that becomes important. Here we see the first sketch of a new model of reality as a result of which thought itself takes a fundamentally and consistently new direction. What has really happened? That the "vertical" dimension is beginning to disappear from the view of reality, and that a model of reality is being sketched, the only dimension of which is the "horizontal." The connexion with "above," with God, is no longer of any interest; the interconnexion of things is sufficient. We call this change in the view of reality "secularism," but we must remember that this is not just something that affected

purely religious or ecclesiastical sphere, but that this process braces the whole of thought and has had incalculable consequences the whole course of history. The new model of reality laid the ndations for the technical development of our age. Thought in "horizontal" dimension is possible only if one sees reality as tied bound in the web of cause and effect. A reality, however, which ds together simply by virtue of the law of cause and effect is a damentally calculable reality, and calculability is the soul of nology. If reality was to be calculable, then its model had to be t strictly to the "horizontal" dimension, for the "vertical" is ntially incalculable. This produced the age of technology which s and is, in the very depths of its being, the age of calculability. is change and its immediate result is even clearer in the sphere of cory. For history too had to become calculable, if the "vertical" nension was eliminated. History too now derived its unity and erence only from the law of cause and effect. Every historical nt is connected with every other event only by the law of cause and ect. On every single occasion all that is necessary is to assess its ses down to the last detail, if we are to reconstruct every period of rld history systematically and exhaustively. The science of history fundamentally nothing but the reconstruction of history. Every iod can be reconstructed on the basis of its own presuppositions. t we must carry the train of thought a stage farther. What can be constructed can also be constructed. Historical science can ultiately be applied not only to the past, but in principle also to the ure, and can construct it on a strictly scientific basis. For everything st evolve according to the laws we know; there may, of course, be ches from time to time, but history must in principle be patient of nstruction. And this has in fact been done.

An essential characteristic of the period under discussion is its revotionary *élan*. Modern revolutions are simply attempts to construct tory on the basis of programs and manifestos. Behind every volutionary program is the claim and the firm conviction that, the basis of the modern insight into the unbroken interconnexion all things, history can be constructed forward into the future with e minimum of risk. Such confidence, needless to say, is possible only ithin the framework of a picture of reality sketched exclusively on e "horizontal" plane.

These things have often been misunderstood. It has, for example, en said that the revolutionary *élan* of the French Revolution was chatological in quality—*i.e.*, sustained by an unconsciously religious ge towards eternity. The very opposite is true. The revolutionary *n* of the present day—*i.e.*, of the period since 1789—exists only because has been possible to eliminate the "vertical" dimension, the "upward ance," since the present-day conception of reality has taken no count whatever, or at any rate no serious account, of this dimension. evolution follows logically from the "horizontal," secularist conption of reality, and from this is derived the fact that no new idea s been accepted as valid unless it could be proved to be revolutionary. Truly revolutionary" was, until a short while ago, as powerful a

recommendation as formerly "truly Christian" had been. But it must be clearly seen that the similarity between the two is deceptive. The two expressions are thinkable and possible only in utterly different dimensions. When the revolutionary makes an assertion, he looks triumphantly around, for *his* world is here. When the Christian makes an assertion, he looks humbly upwards, for *his* world is there. But between the two there is a gulf fixed.

The systematic elimination of the "vertical" dimension can be seen in almost every sphere of contemporary life. In that of law, for example, a view of reality admitting the "vertical" dimension would take it for granted that law is fundamentally divine and eternal in origin, and that the current law partakes of the eternal order, and is only law at all because of this. If, on the other hand, the "vertical" dimension is denied, law loses its eternal origin and its participation in the eternal order; then there is nothing but "natural" law in the sense of the Enlightenment, or just law in the sense of Positivism. This conclusion has, in fact, been drawn by the present age, as, for example, in the formulation of a modern jurist, "Law is the limitation imposed upon sovereign power." This formulation exhausts the possibilities of the "horizontal" approach. The degree to which such a formulation can be realized in practice we have experienced in our own persons, and are still experiencing every day. It is quite impossible to visualize how such a conclusion could be avoided, if one no longer acknowledged the "vertical" dimension. Within the framework of the "horizontal," secularist view of reality, no other conception of law is possible. And it is here that the crisis of our thinking becomes manifest. There is no longer any thoughtful German who does not know for certain that this conception of law is not only morally impossible, but is also no longer practicable. We have experienced law as an order of a different kind. If to-day we speak of right and wrong, then we do not remain on our own level, but, in fact, speak a language which is intelligible only if it takes account of the "vertical" dimension. If we are not completely mistaken, we are at the beginning of a development which will result in the transcending of the conceptions of law held both by the Enlightenment and by Positivism.

The situation is similar in the case of medicine, though no one can deny that here Positivism and Secularism have met with enormous success. The presupposition of modern medical theory is, indeed, the "hermetical sealing-off of all possibility of metaphysical infiltration." Healing is, from this standpoint, ultimately a technical problem, and hospitals are, within the framework of the "horizontal" model of reality, repair-shops of a highly specialized kind. "Metaphysical infiltration," however, could not be entirely avoided, and we are experiencing to-day the remarkable spectacle of *psycho-pathology* raising anew the fundamental question of disease, with explicit emphasis on the "vertical" dimension. For men like Jung, Weizsäcker, and Monakov disease is no longer a technical problem, but has metaphysical aspects. This shift of emphasis is in complete harmony with our present-day experiences. For it can no longer be doubted

neurosis by now plays a part comparable to that of tuberculosis cancer. Modern medicine is gradually coming to see that the mate origin of disease is to be sought not in the bacillus—*i.e.*, not the horizontal plane—but that its final cause is a "lowering of metaphysical level"—*i.e.*, precisely what Christian theology calls In other words, a model of reality constructed on the purely izontal plane is inadequate to explain the actual experiences of our eration. Thus the crisis of modern thought is shown up at the very nt which seemed most heavily fortified against metaphysical ltrations. (To avoid misunderstandings which may suggest themves to certain circles, it must be emphatically stated that this does imply any bias in favour of "nature-cures.")

The inadequacy of the hitherto dominant view of reality has for a g time made itself acutely felt in the sphere of natural science. is can be said without any reference to the highly problematical ertion that the law of causality no longer possesses an unconditional idity within contemporary natural science. It is probable that a nt will be reached at which here also the dogmatic claim of the law causality will undergo a radical revision. We are, however, conned with a process that has wider implications. The conventional odel of reality sketched on the purely "horizontal" plane resulted a definition of the task of science which Heisenberg describes in following terms: "The task was to calculate the course of the iverse from given determining factors, and many investigators were nvinced that it would be possible to accomplish this task, at least principle, in every field. This conception of natural science found most telling expression during the age of rationalism in Laplace's tion of a *dæmon* capable of knowing the whole present state of the iverse in all its determining factors and, on the basis of this knowlge, of calculating the whole future course of the universe." This veals the essential quality of the "horizontal" view of reality, which its conviction of the calculability of the universe throughout its hole extent. That is, it is essentially bourgeois in character; for the eternal blessedness" of the bourgeois consists precisely in the calculbility and security of existence. To-day, however, it has become spect, because the model of reality upon which it was based has llapsed under the pressure of experiences to which our present age exposed. If then Heisenberg goes on to say that "in the exact ience of nature also we have learnt that, for our thinking, reality st divides into separate strata which, as it were, meet only in an bstract space behind phenomena," then we feel in these words the fort with which he lifts his eyes from the "horizontal" plane; yet is probable that one day this "abstract space behind phenomena" ill become considerably more concrete, and become so not as the gical consequence of calculable premisses, but in virtue of the essential tality of the truth which to-day faces us.

The extent to which our attitude to history needs fundamental evision is to-day becoming more and more clear. A generation which as experienced the essential incalculability of history knows that istory is not a matter of construction but of adventure. Therefore

we have a sound suspicion of any kind of calculability in the sphere of history. We no longer draw our inspiration from revolution. But the incalculability of history does not rest merely upon the undeniable fact that we cannot know all the elements that would enable us to calculate the course of events. This would merely be a concession within the framework of the "horizontal" view of the universe, and it would still relate to the unbroken causal connexion of things and events. Our essential experience at the present day is that there may well be yet another kind of historical law—for instance, the law of Substitution or the law of Guilt and Expiation. Thus an ancient attitude to history seems to struggle for expression—namely, that attitude which found its form in tragedy. Tragedy is possible only on a deeper level and in another dimension. It is obvious that the connexion of guilt and expiation also lends itself to secularist misinterpretation. And it is being misinterpreted to-day in terms of an obsolescent view of reality wherever the quest for a scapegoat is simply determined by the desire to salvage a certain degree of calculability in history. Confessions of guilt on this level may rightly be regarded as bourgeois, and in no sense Christian. But there are recognitions of guilt in another dimension, and it is only in virtue of such recognition that we can see what has happened to us as something more profound than a mere historical catastrophe. That which has happened to us is more than merely sad or unfortunate, it is tragic; in it the chill wind of eternity blows through the "human, all-too-human." Here the men of our generation come to the parting of ways. Some concern themselves only with their fellow-men, but others know that we have to do with God. And this knowledge is the starting-point and the goal of all thinking and all science. This knowledge is the science which the language of former ages called *conscience*. In modern usage conscience has become a moral concept; one can be "conscientious" without any reference to eternity. In the language of ages in which eternity was constitutive for the view of reality, conscience simply meant the conviction that one had to do with the eternal. This meaning of conscience must be restored to-day if we are to come to terms with the unavoidable experiences of the present. "To have a conscience" ought to mean to-day to think consistently and radically in terms of a view of reality in which the "vertical" dimension, the "upward glance," is once more axiomatic. There is no sphere of life which can be adequately understood without such a conscience. Not even in technology can one afford to be without a conscience. For there are technical discoveries—*e.g.*, the atomic bomb—which are apocalyptic in character. It would be a betrayal of life and reality to deny, in the face of such experiences, that "the fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom."

What we need to-day is thus no longer a number of new thoughts and a few new ideas. Rather is it a matter of recognizing with despair *and* hope that our thinking up till now has failed in its presuppositions and its direction, and that it has altogether missed reality. We must arrive at a new way of thinking, more congenial to reality, which it will apprehend not only in its "horizontal" dimension, but in depth.

ore and more it seems that a model of reality constructed entirely
the "horizontal" plane can no longer be regarded as adequate.
e are at the beginning of a richer apprehension of the multiple
mensions of reality. It may well be that it will bring with it a genuine
iversitas in which once more all knowledge is directed towards the
ne Being that gives cohesion to all things. Where God is no longer
e self-evident centre of all things, all thinking and all science must
eds become eccentric and centrifugal. But where science is pursued
the true spirit of "conscientiousness," there thinking and science
ll once more become universal.

HANS SCHOMERUS.

Baptism and the Catechumenate

SIX years ago there appeared in THEOLOGY an article by the present
litor with the incisive title "Baptismal Disgrace," a telling exposi-
on of the need of reform in our present practice (which is described
not able to bear a moment's scrutiny), ending with a warning lest
e wrong people should set about the work. It is probably true that
very agitation designed to end an abuse will be made by the wrong
eople as well as by the right ones; but it would be fatal to allow
is fact to inhibit our action altogether. While, therefore, we take
e warning to heart, we are impelled to carry on a movement which
as in fact begun as long ago as 1898, when the Rural Deaneries of
ewsbury and Birstall first had the courage to use the phrase
indiscriminate Baptism." Since then, in many an isolated parish,
nely priests have made valiant and unsupported efforts, sometimes
judicious perhaps, yet not always fruitless, to bring some measure
spiritual reality into baptisms, while the Deaneries of Christianity
nd of Poplar have published valuable reports and pressed for reform.
n at least one diocese a synod has been held on the subject; while
e uneasy consciences of priests have been troubled afresh of late
y the argument of Dom Gregory Dix in a pamphlet of which more
otice has been taken than of Canon Mason's great work on the same
ubject.[1] There are not wanting clergy who describe the present
tuation as "intolerable." Nor is the unrest in only one part of the
hurch; it is affecting "Catholic" and "Evangelical" alike.

None of the half-hearted remedies proposed by the Joint Houses
f Convocation in 1940 have proved effective, and this for several
easons. In the first place, they have been given no authority; the
erbs are conditional: we "should" or "ought," but never "must,"
o certain things. Moreover, nothing has been done by means of
ropaganda to bring them home to the clergy as a whole, so that they
re simply ignored by the vast majority. The only exception would
eem to be the advice to keep a Font Roll; and this, when it is isolated
om the rest and made into a fetish, is likely only to increase the
uggestion that Baptism is an end in itself. There is, again, the failure

[1] *The Theology of Confirmation in Relation to Baptism* (Dacre Press). *Cf.* Mason's *elation of Confirmation to Baptism.*

to recognize that the godparent system, as a guarantee, has completely broken down, and that it is unsuited to conditions in a sub-Christian (almost a post-Christian) society; attempts to resuscitate it have only retarded real reform. That godparents should continue as witnesses, spiritual friends, and intercessors, is greatly to be desired; that they should be encouraged to accept a responsibility which they can no longer fulfil is deplorable.

Despairing of mild improvements, there have now arisen people who propose that we should forgo Infant Baptism altogether. Prohibition, however, is not reform; it would not go to the root of the evil to change indiscriminate admission of infants to Baptism into indiscriminate refusal to baptize any children in infancy. The abolition of the thing abused might be easier than its rescue; but it would mean rushing from one extreme to another, into the arms of the anabaptist. Emphasis has lately been laid upon moral response as an essential element in Christian initiation; but it is evidence of the distance we have gone from the standards of the Book of Common Prayer that we should need such a reminder. We may well agree that we have no right to baptize where there is not full provision for moral response at the age of discretion, or no real guarantee that Baptism will be completed by Confirmation. No mere promise for the future is, by itself, adequate; it must be rooted in the past and present; therefore the guarantors must themselves be communicants, and they must be the parents or guardians of the child.

It will be said that the difficulties of discrimination are too great. But it is exactly discrimination that is needed; apart from it, no remedy can succeed. We have to discover who the faithful laity are, and to do so, though it were necessary to keep in each parish a Communicants' Roll, would be of real worth. Even now, we have to discriminate between communicant and non-communicant in elections to the Parochial Church Council. Is it not strange that we should suppose that Christian parenthood needs a lesser qualification? Definition of a communicant is difficult; the three times a year standard is admittedly unatisfactory, but it is probably the best we can do as yet. Casual comers would be ineligible because they had not taken the trouble to be put on the Roll; and we might even hope that, as the plan became general, the prophetic denunciation of Dr Gore would at last be heeded, so that the Electoral Roll itself became a list of communicants.

Regarding ourselves as an increasingly missionary Church in a country needing reconversion, we should, if we restricted Infant Baptism to the children of communicant parents, be adopting some of the methods found in the best parts of the mission field. But the question arises, What is to be done for the other infant children who are brought to us? The parents are not exactly heathen. Although their motives may usually be conventional or sentimental, and their faith no more than a vague belief in the magical or fashionable efficacy of a christening, yet we have to remember that it is we who, in the past, have ourselves imposed these ideas upon the laity by exhortations and even threats. It is certain that we dare not "forbid"

se parents and children. Somehow they must be received by the urch.

t is here that we must consider the suggestion, which has arisen more than one quarter, that the Catechumenate should be revived the Church of England. This would not only be a following of mitive precedents, but a further attempt to apply missionary thods to the situation. Infants could be brought within the church r to be blessed with the sign of the Cross; and the certificate of their rolment for future instruction could be so drawn up as to point ward to Baptism, Confirmation, and Communion.

Doubtless a large proportion of these children would never go yond this event, in spite of all efforts to follow it up. But even so, ptism would not have been abused; no baptized agnostic would ve been produced; no pearls would have been bestowed merely be trodden underfoot. The parents, too, would for the first time ve a chance to realize that Baptism is a birth and a beginning, t something "done" and done with. There would be more hope at they themselves would desire to be prepared for Confirmation.

Such a restoration of the Catechumenate would admittedly need me years of preparation. The clergy have yet to be persuaded a large scale; the laity must in justice receive full explanation d warning; alterations would have to be made in Canon Law d in the rubrics. It is well to face all this; nevertheless none of it uld appear to be beyond the bounds of possibility. If we have a finite goal in sight, we shall neither give up the struggle in despair r grow unduly impatient as we press towards it.

H. G. Blomfield.

---

tatement on the Artificial Insemination of Livestock

Introduction

Perhaps the present recovery of emphasis upon the concept of atural Order meets its most difficult problem in relating that concept the fact that modern man is increasingly the creator of techniques hich must inevitably operate upon "nature." Has this development technique, in which the human intellect finds so notable an expres-on, an unassailable and overriding right? Can it be credited in dvance with authority and power to transmute "nature" and its rocesses, reordering them for what are believed to be greater human nefits? Or must we, in loyalty to the doctrine of a natural order ven in the divine act of creation, and in "reverence for the world as od has made it" (to quote William Temple), regard the modern chniques with a persistent doubt, if not with plain hostility? Or, t again, are we to abide by the dictum of Dr K. E. Barlow, that n so far as the manipulator recognizes and respects the architecture f nature which begat him, he can modify his instruments to the attern of his reverence"?

The subject of the artificial insemination of cattle provides an teresting, and as will be seen from the following notes, a perplexing,

instance of this problem. In the course of the inquiry, it was found that some agriculturalists and some scientists, of whom a number professed themselves Christians, as well as some Christians who were neither agriculturalists nor scientists, regarded a hypothetical human benefit as of paramount importance, regardless of the claim of a natural order, and of the question whether, if there be a natural order, there can be any ultimate human benefit in disregard of it.

But the more significant discussions actually, if not always consciously, centred upon two questions: (*a*) Whether the techniques of applied science possess in themselves an essential authorization to proceed as a valid transcendence of natural order, as the discovery, or indeed the creation, of a larger order by man's own powers; and (*b*) Admitting the permanent necessity of reverence for the given natural order, whether the specific technique of the artificial insemination of cattle may not, in fact, be considered as an operation "within the pattern of our reverence," not flying in the face of nature, but a justifiable exercise of man's true husbandry.

The notes which follow will show that no final answer was given to these questions. It seems that to both of them, eventually, there may be given both a dogmatic and a practical verdict. The first, concerning the right of the techniques to transcend the given natural order, may receive its dogmatic answer in philosophical theology. The second, as to whether the artificial insemination of cattle is a contradiction of the given order, must probably require a dogmatic answer from technicians in this field. But the practical answers to both questions can come only from experiment. Here we meet the grave issue which has accosted modern man in his "progress": that experimentalism unguided by dogma may lead, and in fact has led, to the menace of human disaster. Perhaps it may be concluded that the discussion of particular issues, such as that undertaken by the Council for the Church and Countryside, will reach no finality until the formulation of a Christian dogma for the guidance of man's future experimentation has been achieved.

* * * * *

1. In view of the demand from many of its members for an investigation of this important subject and, if possible, an authoritative pronouncement, the Council for the Church and Countryside set up in 1944 a commission of inquiry to which various theological and scientific experts were invited to submit evidence. This evidence was in due course assembled and collated, and the whole matter was debated by the Council itself in June, 1945, when it heard further evidence from a veterinary surgeon in charge of one of the first A.I. centres. A report was subsequently prepared.

2. It became clear at a comparatively early stage that unanimity of opinion could not be achieved. This situation arises in part from the fact that cattle-breeding is essentially a long-term business, so that the full effects of a new practice cannot (in the view of many qualified persons) be observed until a number of generations have been bred. But it arises also from the diversity of philosophical back-

ounds (and therefore angles of approach) which exist, not only ong those whom the Commission consulted, but within the Council d indeed within the Church itself. This diversity was reflected th in the evidence and in the conclusions drawn from it.

The inquiry did, however, serve to illuminate (and to some extent fine) at least two quite distinct beliefs regarding man's relationship the rest of the natural kingdom. Since the existence of these is not ways fully realized, it is felt that an objective statement of their plication to what may be regarded as a test case may be of value Churchmen.

3. The inquiry was not directly concerned with the immediate hnical feasibility of artificial insemination or with its economic pects. In other words, its object was to try to determine, not whether I. "works" or whether it "pays," but whether it is *right*, and refore in the long run good or evil in its consequences.

Even this limitation of objective was at once challenged. One inent geneticist, for instance, clearly resented any attempt on the rt of the Church to criticize A.I. at all. His view was that the actice, like the use of artificial fertilizers and machinery, was of h benefit in enabling more food to be produced for less human ort that its moral aspects could not be questioned. The Church, his opinion, should confine itself to assisting people to make better e of the increased leisure so obtained, as for instance by the ontemplation of the real meaning of life."

A prominent cleric, again, on the grounds that man's interests errode those of the lower creation, "could not see that A.I. raised y moral or theological issue *per se*." He considered that "the oper ideal for the Church was the christianization rather than the probation of the scientific movement." A rather similar view was t forward during the Council debate by a layman, who argued at, since "men have souls and animals have not," no harm could se so long as men did not spiritually injure themselves by indulgence cruelty.

4. Sharply opposed to such "departmentalism" was the doctrine the wholeness of creation propounded by a small group of theo-gians directly interested in rural life, and reinforced from the bio-gical angle by laymen prominently associated with what may be rmed the Organic Movement.

The theologians maintained, as a logical deduction from "Scripture d the main Christian theological tradition," that man's "dominion" er the natural realm is "derivative and functional, not absolute." e is thus to be regarded as the trustee of a created order, the structure which must be respected in his dealings with it. From this point of ew, the Church has the responsibility of deciding the moral validity agricultural practices, provided that the facts are duly established.

The laymen contended in effect that Nature is the perfect husband-an and the final arbiter (this view is not inconsistent with the ncept of man's trusteeship). They maintained that many of the ctors concerned in the mating of cattle are as yet unknown or at any te little understood, and that A.I. should have been submitted to

lengthy and exhaustive tests before being put forward as a practice of proven merit (advocates of A.I. claim that such tests have already been provided by experience in other countries, such as the U.S. and Denmark).

5. Corresponding to the division of opinion as to the limits of theology as a guide to human action in the natural order is one as to the interpretation of natural laws as a guide to agricultural practice. Thus the "departmentalists" contend that A.I. is no more "interference with Nature" than is castration and involves less cruelty, and that in any case such interference is legitimized by human needs. The "whole creation" school, on the other hand, regard good husbandry as the humble observance of natural laws to the end that man may cultivate the natural surplus by which he lives. They maintain that A.I. goes much farther than castration (which is equivalent to the elimination of surplus males in wild Nature by combat or exile) in that it degrades a complex biological function to the level of a routine mechanical process, and that, so far as man himself is concerned, it will mechanize (or at least rationalize) one of the few remaining arts.

6. It should be noted that during the Council debate a third, reconciliatory point of view was put forward by the veterinary surgeon already mentioned and met with considerable support. This witness accepted the theological, and agreed with most of the "organic," arguments, but maintained that A.I. had merits as a temporary expedient which, by improving the quality of our livestock, would ultimately encourage rather than undermine good husbandry and make for better relationships between man and his domesticated animals.

The Apostolic Ministry—II

Some Matters of Detail

1. *The Sacerdotium of the Presbyter.* Dr Kirk's concise statement (p. 13) that for several centuries the bishop alone was called *sacerdos* (*archiereus*) implies that for several centuries before A.D. 370, when Optatus refers to the *sacerdotium* of presbyters (pp. 282, 336), (*a*) the bishop was called priest and (*b*) the presbyter was not. According to Dom Dix "the old episcopal title of priest begins to be used of individual presbyters early in the second half of the fourth century," while Dr Jalland speaks of Isaac (*i.e.*, Ambrosiaster) and the Ignatian interpolator (both late fourth century) taking the crucial step of applying the significant term *sacerdos* (*hiereus*) to the presbyter.

(*a*) When was the bishop first called priest? Certainly by Tertullian and Hippolytus. But this (*c.* 200-370) is not several centuries. The longer period turns, I believe, on the interpretation of 1 *Clement* 40, where Clement commends good order and obedience to the Christian ministry by an analogy with the divinely appointed ministry of the Old Testament. The analogy may be general (that is, the two ministries may be compared *en bloc*) or particular (that is, minister to minister, severally). Only in the latter case is the bishop as such compared to the high priest, and, if so, the presbyter is compared to the priest,

; Dom Dix takes it on p. 246 and in *The Shape of the Liturgy* (p. 1). it not a case of both or neither? And, at most, it is only an analogy, ie point of which lies not in priesthood itself, but in the divine dering of the ministry. After that there is nothing before Tertullian, ough the Hippolytean consecration prayer *may* be evidence of arlier usage.

(*b*) When was the presbyter first called priest? If not by Clement, as he before Optatus? Dom Dix admits (p. 225, n. 2) that Hippolytus erhaps recognizes the priesthood of the presbyter in one passage, and at he always calls the bishop *high* priest. So does the Didascalia II, 26), and so does Tertullian, who uses *sacerdotes*, *sacerdotium*, *erdotalis* of the clergy as a whole, contrasted with *laici* (*Præscr.* 41, *ast.* 7, *Monog.* 7 and 12). These passages have so often been cited in is sense that if Dom Dix and Dr Jalland disagree they should give eir reasons instead of passing them over in silence. Similarly with yprian. Though he almost always means bishop by *sacerdos* (he does ot call him *summus sacerdos*), in Epp. 1 and 72 probably, and in pp. 40 and 61, 3 definitely, I think, he allows *sacerdotium* to the resbyter. In Ep. 40 the confessor Numidicus is ordained presbyter ut . . . desolatam per lapsum quorundam presbyterorum nostrorum opiam gloriosis sacerdotibus adornaret." I may quote Brightman's ote in Swete's *Essays*, p. 395: "Tertullian appears commonly to use *cerdos* of the presbyter; Hippolytus, *Order* 3 § 2, attributes the *acerdotium* to presbyters; for Origen the presbyter is *inferior sacerdos* s contrasted with the bishops *qui populis præsunt* (*hom. xi in Exod. i*); nd S. Cyprian, besides regarding the presbyters as *cum episcopo acerdotali honore coniuncti* (Ep. 61, 3), once uses *sacerdotes* of presbyters Ep. 40)." No doubt the presbyter was not commonly referred o as *sacerdos*, since he did not normally celebrate. "Our priest" ould be the bishop. But the presbyter could "offer," and when he id he was, to the third century, *sacerdos*. I do not see that this has uch, if any, bearing on the relation between primitive *episcope* and he presbyter.

(*c*) Dr Jalland (p. 336) suggests that the "assimilation" was particularly slow in Africa since some canons of the African Codex use *acerdotes* exclusively of bishops. Canon 55 would be a better choice han his 26 (misprint for 24?) and 39; but in 3 presbyters are *sacerdotes*. Anyhow his footnote about Optatus, which is decisive for Africa, nakes the later canons comparatively unimportant and destroys his emark about Augustine. It is more scholarly to change one's text han to invalidate it in a footnote. Further, Sermon 137, 8 does not ven use the word *sacerdotes*, but simply distinguishes *clerici* (§ 7) rom *laici* who cannot offer sacrifices. In fact, Augustine is quite xplicit in *De Civ. Dei* xx, 10, "non utique de solis episcopis et presbyteris lictum est, qui proprie iam vocantur in ecclesia sacerdotes." A better nstance of conservative documents may be found in the Gallic Council of Turin (398) and Riez (439). And Socrates still uses *hierosune* of the bishop.

(*d*) The wording of Dr Jalland's references to Ambrosiaster is a little misleading. He does not clearly bring out the essential point

that the author of the Commentaries, long known as Ambrosiaster, has now been proved to be the author also of the pseudo-Augustinian *Quæstiones*. The minor point, the suggested identification with Isaac the Jew, is so uncertain that it may be better to keep to the neutral Ambrosiaster.

2. *Presbyter and Episkopos in the New Testament.* That *presbuteros* can mean "an older man" is obvious; but Dr Farrer's argument against the identification of the official elder with the *episkopos* is unconvincing. The crucial cases are (*a*) Titus i, 5-7 and (*b*) Acts xx, 17, 28.

(*a*) "Nothing in 1 Timothy corrects the impression that monepiscopacy is the system described" (p. 159). This is because *episkopos* is singular in c. 3 and presbyters occurs separately in c. 5. But the singular in itself proves nothing, and the omission of presbyter in c. 3, with the transition from *episkopos* to *diakonoi*, is more significant than its occurrence in c. 5 (*cf.* Phil. i, 1, *Didache* 15, 1 *Clem.* 42). Next, he argues, it is difficult to get a knife's edge between the Pastorals and the Ignatian letters to monepiscopal Asia. But only if the Pastorals are *very* late in the first century. The case now becomes philological. *Ei tis* in the Pastorals is always to be construed with what follows. But (i) in v, 4 *widow* takes up *widows* of v, 3; in vi, 3 *heterodidaskaloi* takes up *didaske* of vi, 2; while in v, 16 the logical tie with 15 is close; (ii) in all four cases the *ei tis* clause is followed by a main clause with a main verb, while on his reading of Titus i we must supply a verb—his "here's your man." But if 6 goes with 5 no supplement is necessary, the construction is straightforward, and *gar* clinches the connexion. Would anyone write, "Appoint presbyters. (Full stop, no particle.) If anyone is blameless [appoint him bishop], for the bishop must be blameless"? Why create the difficulty by mentioning presbyters first?

(*b*) Dr Farrer must have found Acts xx awkward, since he reserves it until he has made out his case as far as he can. Then the *only* argument is, "If the hypothesis is correct, there was no danger of St Luke being misunderstood." Everyone knew that the elders were not bishops, though elders with their bishops can be adjectivally described as overseers in the flock." Did St Paul forget to invite the Bishop of Ephesus to Miletus, or was he among the elders who, everyone knows, were not bishops?

3. *Apostolic Succession in 1 Clement 44.* The difficulties of the passage are notorious. Dom Dix sets out very fairly the case for "if the first *episkopoi* fall asleep, other approved men should succeed to the liturgy of the first *episkopoi* (*auton*)," and admits its strength. Accepting, however, the reading *epinomin*, second enactment, he finds this a fatal objection to the above view, since "the question whether or not presbyters were to be replaced must have been settled . . . long before A.D. 60." This date comes from *metaxu*, interpreted on p. 258 as "presumably = towards the end of the apostolic age." But this inference is only necessary if the subject of "fall asleep" is apostles (*i.e.*, his view); while if the subject is "the first *episkopoi*" the second provision can have been very soon after the first, as soon indeed as it became clear that some elders would die before the Parousia.

A point against Dom Dix's case may be added to those which he nfesses. For him, *ekeinon* is (rightly, I think) the apostles. But, so, can the immediately preceding *auton* refer also to the apostles? ust *ekeinon* not refer back beyond *auton*?

Anyhow, Dom Dix says, Clement witnesses, in *heteron ellogimon*, to continuance of the apostolic function of ordaining local *episkopoi*. s, but Clement puts them beside the apostles, and is not a witness them as commissioned *shelihim*. Rather, the primitive situation kes it highly probable that "unordained" missionaries started istries. What happened at Rome before Peter and Paul?

Administrative History. (*a*) *Early monepiscopacy*. On p. 254 the gument is fair so far as concerns Rome, but not Philippi, since lycarp tells the Philippians to obey the presbyters and deacons as od and Christ (c. 5), which implies that there is no bishop.

P. 264. What is the evidence that "neighbouring Syrian churches d their own bishops" in Ignatius' day? If "of Syria" is any more an geographical, Ignatius may have used the phrase because he was e only bishop there.

(*b*) *Deacons*. In Swete's *Essays*, p. 395, Brightman quoted Cyprian, pp. 5 and 34, to show that deacons were attached to individual esbyters celebrating the Eucharist. Dom Dix (p. 196) and Dr liand (p. 314) drop 34 but keep 5. No doubt a deacon assisted the elebrant where possible, but this letter, I think, should be otherwise erpreted. Cyprian wants to help the imprisoned confessors materi- y and spiritually, and prudence demands that visitors should be w. So one deacon goes from the bishop with financial help.

(*c*) *Episcopal elections*. Dom Dix's position on p. 199 is sound so far it goes, though "acceptance by *all* its members" is too strong, ce Novatian had a following at Rome. But he omits a true *sine qua* —namely, that the see should be vacant. Since Cornelius was idly elected before Novatian, the latter could not be bishop. piscopo semel facto, alium constitui nullo modo posse" (Ep. 44 § 3).

(*d*) *The papal decem provinciæ*, pp. 271-2. The special papal control ay truly be independent of Rome's secular position, but not for the ason given in n. 2. The ten provinces *were* governed by one secular icial, not the *præfectus urbi*, but the *vicarius*. Roman writers (*e.g.*, tiffol and Palanque) invert Dom Dix's argument. Admitting that e specifically suburbicarian jurisdiction is somehow secular in origin, y say that *earlier* Rome exercised such rights over all Italy.

(*e*) *Metropolitans*. On p. 275 Dom Dix does not allow sufficiently for e-Nicene metropolitans. On p. 276 the statement that the metro- litan is automatically provided by the bishop of the civil capital the province in the fourth century is qualified only by a note about e-Nicene primates in Africa. But the African practice survived for nturies, and there was much dispute in Gaul during the fourth ntury about what gave a right to primacy.

The word eparchy means "province" at least as often as "group of ovinces." Groups corresponding to the civil diocese could be called exarchate, the bishop of the civil capital being exarch, after halcedon (451). But the patriarchates did *not* "correspond well

enough with prætorian prefectures." Antioch and Alexandria corresponded with civil dioceses; Jerusalem with very little; Constantinople with three civil dioceses; Rome, if that was the western patriarchate, with two prefectures (or three with Illyricum). Only the papal vicar at Thessalonica, not a patriarch, corresponded with a prefect.

(*f*) *Diœcesis*, p. 294. This term was used for a see *before* the seventh century—*e.g.*, C. Carthage (390), can. 5; Augustine, Ep. 133; Leo, Ep. 157.

5. *Miscellaneous.* (*a*) *Validity in Ignatius*, p. 309. If Dr Jalland intends to distinguish between the irregularity of non-episcopal baptism and the invalidity of non-episcopal eucharists in Smyrnæns 8, I do not think that Ignatius' words allow it. After the apparent distinction between *bebaia* and *ouk exon*, he repeats *bebaion*, this time including all he has referred to—eucharist, baptism, and agape. And if we translate *bebaion* valid, it must here mean less than in later thought.

(*b*) *Whittingham.* This case scarcely proves "the extreme care taken by the Church of England that no one who was not episcopally ordained should usurp priestly functions" (p. 408), since he had been Dean many years before he was attacked. Nor was he regarded as a lay Dean.

(*c*) Can anything be of the *esse* of the Church *in this country*? (p. 422).

(*d*) "Considerable support among the Elizabethans for the divine origin of the episcopate" (p. 429). To Darwell Stone they were a broken reed for anything but the practical requirement. See *J.T.S.*, xliv. 241.

(*e*) Wilberforce deserves praise (p. 448), but is he not, here and elsewhere, given rather more than his due at the expense of Blomfield?

S. L. Greenslade.

Why You Should Read It—VI

Life and Letters of Frederick W. Robertson, M.A., Incumbent of Trinity Chapel, Brighton, 1847-53. Edited by Stopford A. Brooke, M.A., late Chaplain to the Embassy at Berlin. In two volumes: with Portraits. First Edition 1865. Second Edition 1866. Third Edition (London: Smith, Elder and Co., 1866).

At a Kentish spa, once celebrated and still in spite of "modern improvements" in part wonderfully attractive, there stands hard by a church of King Charles the Martyr a bookshop notable not only for many treasures for the rich, but for what does not disdain to describe itself as "The best Sixpenny Rack in England." It is to two volumes which once adorned it that this short article is devoted. There may be some who would say, "Why spend time on a book produced by an unorthodox editor relating to a preacher of the Victorian age?" For them a sufficient answer may be found in the two statements—(*a*) that Mr Stopford Brooke, who died in 1916 in his eighty-fourth year, in any case wrote it at a time when his later views had not developed and, being a man of high literary gifts, gave to it the same kind of vividness and sympathetic interest which has for so long maintained in popularity

ean Stanley's *Life of Arnold*, (*b*) that the fame of Robertson of Brighton a preacher still survives long after the obloquy and controversial imus to which he was exposed have been forgotten. His short life 816-53) covers a period in English history, as well ecclesiastical secular, which those who know of it, whether from the descriptions their grandparents or parents or from the very numerous works at have been written about it, will probably judge to have been a mative era of no small importance. The letters which occupy so rge a space in these volumes throw a good deal of light both on the ial and individual features and reactions of the time; and the editor's ficult task in using them as materials for biography has been hieved with a skill which manages to convey a clear-cut and at the me time a deeply impressive picture of the man who wrote them. obertson's own attitude to the subject is disclosed in a very character- ic passage in one of the latest of his letters. He had been composing lecture on Wordsworth which contains "a fine defence of the poet gainst the vulgar accusations of egotism and inconsistency," and h reference to the memoir by his nephew Christopher Wordsworth, terwards Bishop of Lincoln, writes to an unnamed correspondent:

> I rejoice that you like Wordsworth's "Life." Badly and coldly as it is ritten, the extracts from his own letters give some insight into his inner life. nd it seems to me, in reading lives, the question too often is, whether it be one nich in all respects answers our ideal of a life; whereas the question ought to , whether it has strongly exhibited some side or other of our manifold and any-sided life. I am satisfied with One life—with One ideal, and I read all hers to understand that, by illustration or contrasts of their whole to parts it. Now Wordsworth throws some light on its purely contemplative side. he life of Action and Sacrifice is wanting, but I can find those in various rms—in Wellington's life, or women's, etc.

The estimate and standard implied are worthy of consideration en by those who do not accept them; in any case, those who would derstand either the man or the preacher must take them into ccount. Mr Stopford Brooke writes of a sermon (in the first volume the collected sermons) preached on the last day of 1849 on the neliness of Christ that "it was an unconscious but vivid portrait his own career and life; it was written with the blood of his own eart." Such a man will have things to say to the hearts as well s the minds of others, and it cannot be said of Robertson, as it has een said of some preachers notable in their day, that their message the heart left the mind unaffected. To his biographer, at any rate, e seems one who "united, in a rare combination, imaginative with ialectic power. He felt a truth before he proved it; but when once it ad been felt, then his logical power came into play . . . step by step e led his hearers from point to point, till, at last, he placed them on he summit, whence they could see all the landscape of his subject in armonious and connected order." That is a very high claim for any reacher or lecturer, and when such capacity is combined with assionate earnestness and consuming zeal things begin to happen hereat some thank God and take courage, even if others begin to avil and misrepresent with a malice which to the later historical

student in retrospect will seem the more loathsome because spread over with a veneer of religion. To a man like Robertson as revealed in these volumes this kind of malevolence was the harder to bear because "if he hated one thing more than another, it was the reputation of being a popular preacher. . . . Moreover, he felt that he was more than a fine speaker; and yet, most unfortunately, he convinced himself that his hearers only saw in him a beautiful talker, and not a teacher." But the desire to teach was not the product of that didactic pedantry which when unseasoned with humour repels many and attracts few. It had its origin in his own intellectual and spiritual experience and a deep longing, at whatever cost to himself, to help others to share in what as he deemed had been given to himself. "The Cross, or the cap and bells," he wrote in a letter of January, 1849. "Certainly, had it not been for ONE, I should say, the cap and bells."

> Truths would you teach, or save a sinking land;
> All fear, none aid you, and few understand.

There is truth in Mr Stopford Brooke's observation that Robertson "might have been wrecked on the same rock as Coleridge," even if we should hesitate to compare the two men in most other respects. And it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that behind the somewhat hyperbolical language of the editor in the section on "the causes of the gloom in" Robertson's "letters"—in itself a by no means general feature—there is an evidence of a conflict in which ethical concepts are not less intimately engaged than metaphysical. His was a temperament tortured by the thought of the guilt and suffering of Humanity and the implied contradiction of the truth that the Ruler of this world is Love. "In proportion to the strange depth of his power of suffering with men, and to the almost preternatural keenness with which he felt the mystery of the great problem of the universe, was the slowness with which he found the answer. But he did find it—as the reader of his letters will see—and in the Cross of Christ. Once found, he acquiesced in its teaching, quietly and faithfully. All questioning, all doubt left him as he drew near to the close of his career." There are passages which suggest comparison with writings of Frederick Denison Maurice, if also contrasts in treatment. But in both cases the solution arrived at entailed a modification, at times an almost passionate repudiation, of certain forms of expression which had become conventionally erected into dogmas. Such men are almost invariably targets for hostility the more deeply wounding in proportion to their sensitive consciousness of the costliness of the struggle for truth. And such misconceptions alike of what is in intention essential orthodoxy in doctrine and of what is believed in all sincerity to be the social implications of the Gospel could, and in Robertson's case did, become real torture to the victim. "I had tried," he once wrote, "to *feel* the meaning of Christ's words, and to make my heart beat with His; and so I became what they call a Radical. Nevertheless, the Radicals and Chartists refuse to own me as a brother, and call me a rabid Tory." And he went on to explain the reason why in regard to some subjects he could not comply with his correspondent's wish that he should "keep language unequivocal."

Robertson, who had become an undergraduate at Brasenose in 837, a curate at Winchester in 1840 and at Cheltenham in 1842, ccepted from Bishop Wilberforce the living of St Ebbe's at Oxford 1 May, 1847. The church, we are told, "was thronged with . . . oung men, who hung breathlessly on every word he uttered." In uly, however, he allowed himself to be persuaded to reconsider a revious refusal to transfer his energies to Trinity Chapel, Brighton. The trustees of that proprietary chapel had approached the bishop, ho approved of the change. Mr Stopford Brooke says that "the usterities, the seclusion from society, even the reading of that class of evotional books which rather tend to weaken than to strengthen haracter, were all put aside at Brighton." Some at any rate will udy with curious interest the sidelights afforded by these volumes n the Oxford and Winchester and Cheltenham and Brighton of a undred years ago, especially from an ecclesiastical point of view. ut they may be even more deeply interested in the accoun. of the eaction of Robertson himself at each stage to the environment in which e found himself, and the study of the kind of mind and temperament hich was reacting. "Hebrew, Italian, and German," he wrote in 852, "I learned after leaving the university." French he had learned n Paris while waiting for a commission in the Army, which had been he career of his grandfather and father and three of his brothers. ome anticipation of what has already been said above may be und in the reference in the same letter to the "dark vistas of doubt and yrrhonism" opened up by contemporary German literature and heology, and at the same time he is credited with having learnt the *nferno* of Dante by heart, and certainly in 1858 translated into English essing's treatise on "The Education of the Human Race." That man with this background and upbringing should be found ifficult to place according to the party labels of the day is under- andable. But even those who, like the reviewer of this book in *The uardian*, could describe it as "a record disclosing a man with great aults and conspicuous blanks in his nature" may recognize how ntirely he could have agreed with them and form, it may be, a indlier estimate of the life and work of a preacher whose appeal was ot only to the intellectuals but to all sorts and conditions of men. And any who can read his sermons with some capacity of appreciation f time and place will not be likely wholly to disagree with Mr Stopford rooke's estimate: "He clothed in fresh brightness the truths which, ecause their garments were worn out, men had ignorantly imagined o be exhausted. He drew out the living inspiration of the Bible, and specially of the historical portions of the Old Testament. He made en feel the life which ran through the doctrinal statements of the rayer Book. Whatever he touched sprang into being; and many of his earers entered on a new existence."

Whatever our opinion of Robertson's theological standpoint and omiletic achievement, and with whatever allowances for changes of utlook in the course of a century since, there are few of us who vould venture to say that the characteristics thus summarized have othing to suggest to the modern preacher. And there is usually

something to learn from a sympathetic effort to realize another man's difficulties whether the viewpoint be that of the pulpit or the pew. The result may not be understanding, but at least it ought to be a safeguard alike against contemptuous undervaluation and against misconstruction and consequent misrepresentation. The late Dr Richard Garnett debited Robertson with an entire lack of humour and credited him with being "not only a genius, but a man of unique genius." There is an element of exaggeration in both sides of the estimate perhaps, as there is also in a reference to "perpetual overstatement, especially in his private correspondence," which is none the less extolled for "vehemence of emotion, beauty of description, depth of thought, and refinement of taste." The humour may seem at times a little macabre, but it certainly is not wanting, and those who take the book up will find it hard to lay aside until it has been finished.

Claude Jenkins.

Studies in Texts

"Ye stiffnecked and uncircumcised in heart and ears"

This man does not cease speaking words against the Holy Place and the Law. For we have heard him saying that this Jesus the Nazarene will destroy this place and change the customs which Moses gave us.—Acts vi, 13*f.*

This is the accusation which was laid against Stephen. Recent critics, almost to a man, have decided that in his speech at his trial he never answered the charge. Furneaux, *Commentary on Acts* (1912), p. 90, notes "the absence of obvious connection between the speech and the occasion out of which it arose." Lake and Cadbury (*Beginnings of Christianity* (1933), Part I, Vol. IV), remark: "This is not a rebuttal of the charges brought against him. . . . The speech has no clear logical construction" (p. 69). But they add, consolingly," All observation shows that religious or political pioneers when brought into court never attempt to rebut the accusations brought against them, but use the opportunity for making a partisan address" (p. 70). And Foakes-Jackson (*Moffatt Commentary* (1931), p. 61), says: "the patriarchal history in the speech contains little applicable to the accusations brought against Stephen." He notes, as do others, that the name of Jesus Christ is not mentioned in the speech.

Opinions about the real point or points of the speech vary widely. Furneaux picks as the main subjects the ephemeral nature and limitations of the Jews' worship, and the obstinacy of the Jews. He also manages to see the concept of progressive revelation in it. Lake and Cadbury imagine that "the underlying contention of Stephen seems to be that the Law was the word of God which ought to be observed, but was not" (*op. cit.*, p. 69). To Furneaux's two themes, which they recognize also, they add the doctrine of the parallel between the Jews' treatment of Jesus and their ancestors' treatment of Moses, Joseph, and the prophets. Foakes-Jackson and Dr Wilfred Knox (in his *St Paul and the Church of Jerusalem*) hold that Stephen's attitude to the Law is the key to his speech, and are quite sure that it

as entirely different from St Paul's. But this agreement appears as striking when we find that Knox's conception of *Paul's* view of the Law is very like Foakes-Jackson's idea of *Stephen's* attitude to the Law and Foakes-Jackson's conception of *Paul's* attitude to the Law not at all unlike what Knox thinks was *Stephen's* view of it. "There is no hint in this speech," says Foakes-Jackson (*op. cit.*, p. 65), "that the Law is not obligatory. Stephen maintains that the Law is perfect and that the Jews disregard it." St Paul, on the other hand (he adds), admitted that the Jews kept the Law but held that it was insufficient. But Knox believes (*op. cit.*, p. 51, n. 10) that the message of Stephen's speech "amounts to the doctrine that our Lord has revealed that both the Law and the Temple were from the outset false developments." Stephen's view, he says elsewhere (*op. cit.*, p. 54, n. 24), is of course entirely contrary to St Paul's belief in the Law as the necessary preliminary to the Gospel." These two views of these two scholars are as incompatible as any temperaments ventilated in a divorce court, and it is hard to resist the conclusion that both commentators are animated by a greater desire to prove that Stephen's views are inconsistent with Paul's than genuinely to discover what his views were.

To find a really satisfactory exposition of Stephen's speech we must go as far back as 1901, to Rackham's *Commentary*. Rackham states unequivocally that Stephen was interpreting O.T. history to demonstrate that it revealed Jesus to be (1) the Saviour, Redeemer, and so Ruler of His people; (2) the true Prophet and Mediator between God and His people; and (3) the Righteous One—that is, the Fulfiller and therefore the End of the Law. "Though the name of Christ is not once mentioned," he says (*Commentary*, p. 93), "Stephen is all the time 'preaching Jesus.' He preaches Him in His types, especially Joseph and Moses." This is the clear and consistent theme of Stephen's speech, and his point-by-point answer to the accusations made against him; if anybody wants to see the speech adequately expounded, he must turn to Rackham's *Commentary*.

But this article would be a waste of paper did I not think that Rackham's exposition needed supplementing on some points, particularly on Stephen's treatment of the Temple and the Law. Rackham does not realize that on the subject of the Temple Stephen is saying, not John iv, 21 ("The hour cometh when neither in this mountain nor in Jerusalem shall ye worship the Father"), but John ii, 19, 21, "Jesus answered and said unto them, Destroy this temple and in three days I will raise it up. . . . But he spake of the temple of his body." God never allowed His people under the Old Covenant to have a permanent dwelling-place for Him, because the permanent σκηνή and ναός for Him was Jesus Christ, the House not made with hands. Nor does Rackham quite realize that Stephen's contention about the Law was precisely the same as St Paul's (in, *e.g.*, Rom. x) —*i.e.*, that the Law *foretold* Jesus, not that its principles were fulfilled in Him (a doctrine of which neither Paul nor Stephen seems ever to have heard). This is a truth which nobody to-day sufficiently realizes in treating of the attitude of the N.T. writers to the Law.

A very brief survey of Stephen's speech (Acts vii, 2-53) will make these points clear. Verses 2 to 8 speak of the patriarchal times. The κληρονομία, the σπέρμα and the promise (ἐπηγγείλατο, v. 5) were all promises meaning Christ; compare Gal. iii, 16, "to Abraham were spoken αἱ ἐπαγγελίαι καὶ τῷ σπέρματι αὐτοῦ . . . ἀλλ' ὡς ἐφ' ἑνός ὅς ἐστιν Χριστός; and iii, 18, "But God hath granted it (ἡ κληρονομία) to Abraham by promise"; and iv, 28, "Now we, brethren, as Isaac was, are children of promise" (compare too Rom. iv, 13 and viii, 17). Verses 9 to 14 of Stephen's speech go on to develop the parallel between Joseph and Christ; this development is admirably delineated by Rackham. Verses 15 and 16 tell of Jacob's movements, how "he went down to Egypt and he died . . . and they put him in the tomb which Abraham had bought for the price of silver from the sons of Emmor in Sychem." Is Jacob thought to be a type of Christ in that Christ went down to "the great city which spiritually is called Sodom and Egypt, where also their Lord was crucified" (Rev. xi, 8), and there died and was put in a tomb bought by another? And should we try to discover in Stephen's allusions to Emmor and Sychem some such allegorical meaning as that which the author of Hebrews thought Melchizedek to possess?

Verses 17 to 38 elaborate a parallel between Moses and Christ, very well drawn out by Rackham in his *Commentary*. Rackham thinks the βασίλευς ἕτερος of v. 18 is Rome; I should prefer Herod, who also ill-treated infants, or even (with considerable support in the Fathers) Satan.

Verses 38 to 43 describe the disobedience of the people to the Law. Dr Wilfred Knox has here a theory that Stephen thought that the second giving of the Law after the first tables had been broken represented an imperfect Law and tabernacle in contrast to the first Law written on the tables subsequently because of Israel's disobedience broken, and that Stephen calls this latter the "living oracles" (v. 38; see Knox, *op. cit.*, p. 44 and p. 55, n. 33). The contradiction which he sees between this theory and the fact that Stephen later approves of David, the "man after God's own heart," who kept the imperfect Law and not the earlier one, Knox puts down to the inherent contrariness of Stephen's interpretation, and not to the gratuitously complicated nature of his own theory. It is much more straightforward to assume that Stephen means that, had Israel obeyed the "living oracles" given them by Moses, they would not have worshipped idols, but would have looked for and welcomed Christ (compare Rom. x, where in vv. 4 to 15 St Paul contends that Moses in Deuteronomy preached justification by faith in Christ, and in vv. 16 to 21 points out how the Jews disobeyed this preaching).

Verses 44 to 50 speak of the Tabernacle and the House of God. The Tabernacle was a type of the Word who tabernacled among us; that was why God would have no permanent abode for Himself made. The true Dwelling-place of God, in Whom "dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily" (Col. ii, 9), was to come.

Verses 51 and 53 make the whole meaning of Stephen's speech clear. The speech does not break off abruptly, as so many critics

ume; the verses are a summary of the foregoing verses, drawing moral. If you had observed the Law, says Stephen, you would ve seen that Jesus the Nazarene was sent by God to supersede both Temple and the customs given by Moses; all the Scriptures, pired by the Holy Ghost, speak of Him; the Law was divinely lained to foretell His coming. But—"Ye stiffnecked and uncir- mcised in heart and ears, ye do always resist the Holy Ghost." e themes concerning the disobedience of the Jews, the temporary ture of the Temple, and the validity of the Law are all there, but are all subordinate to the main one of "preaching Jesus."

Finally, does Stephen mention Jesus by name? I cannot believe that verse 45 the phrase μετὰ Ἰησοῦ ἐν τῇ κατασχέσει τῶν ἐθνῶν could ve meant to the Christian of his day only, "with Joshua when they tered on the possession of the nations," and would not also have ggested the meaning, "with Jesus when he claimed the Gentiles his possession." After all, if Paul can say that in some sense the k that followed the children of Israel in the desert was Christ, Cor. x, 4), why cannot Stephen suggest that in some sense Joshua s Jesus?

There is no doubt that Stephen's audience fully understood the int of his speech; otherwise they would hardly have stoned him. cannot help reflecting that, if Stephen were to hear that scholars the twentieth century were perplexed about the intention of his t speech he might apply to them—for he was evidently not a man to ace his words—the same uncomplimentary epithets that he applied his audience nineteen hundred odd years ago.

R. P. C. Hanson.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

Lic. theol. Hans Schomerus was until the outbreak of the war irector of Studies at the Evangelical Seminary at Wittenberg. lost his home and all his possessions during the war, and is w Pastor in a little parish near Hamburg. The paper was prepared the most harassing conditions of collapse, and with no access what- er to notes or books. The author takes a leading part in the pre- ratory work for the foundation of a theological college near Hamburg. plans to write a book which is to develop the ideas expressed in s paper into a systematic *Christliche Wirklichkeitslehre*.

The Rev. H. G. Blomfield is Vicar of Newquay.

The Rev. S. L. Greenslade is Lightfoot Professor of Divinity in the niversity of Durham.

Dr Claude Jenkins is Regius Professor of Ecclesiastical History in e University of Oxford.

The Rev. R. P. C. Hanson is Vice-Principal of the Queen's College, rmingham.

BOOK REVIEWS

THE COMPLETE WORKS OF SAINT TERESA OF JESUS. Translated and edited by E. Allison Peers. 3 vols. Sheed and Ward. £3 3s.

All who care for the things of the spirit are deeply indebted to Prof. Allison Peers for his untiring labours in the field of Spanish spirituality. He has given us lives of St John of the Cross, St Teresa, and Ramon Lull, together with studies of seventeen other writers of the Golden Age, all marked by sound scholarship, insight, and charm. His object in writing these books was not merely to give his readers information about these authors but to lead them to read the authors themselves. The English reader was, however, handicapped by the fact that in some cases no translation existed, while in none was the English edition made from an accurate text of the original. Prof. Peers therefore set himself to remedy this defect for the most important authors; as far back as 1923 he published translations of portions of Ramon Lull, followed in 1926 by the *Spiritual Exercises* of Garcia de Cisneros; in 1935 appeared his critical edition of St John of the Cross, and now his eagerly awaited edition of St Teresa has at last been published, the appearance of which is an event of first importance to all students of spirituality.

To say that the works of St Teresa are classics of the spiritual life is a commonplace which, like most commonplaces, is only partly true, for they are more than that. To suggest that St Teresa is simply one of the multitude of great spiritual writers of the Church is to misrepresent her importance as seriously as to maintain that she has said both the first and the last word on prayer and the life of the spirit. The infinite variety of the saints is one of the great themes of the *Paradiso* of Dante, and it is no disparagement of the other saints whose works have come down to us to say that, between them, St Teresa and St John of the Cross give us a philosophy of the spiritual life which we find nowhere else. Thanks to Prof. Peers we now have a definitive English edition of the works of both these saints.

The existing translations of St Teresa are based on the Spanish text of Vicente de la Fuente, which appeared as long ago as 1861 and which even Fr Benedict Zimmerman admits to have been "far from accurate"; Prof. Peers' text is that of P. Silverio, 1915-24, which is an accurate recension of the original MSS with notes, the most important of which are printed here.

The textual evidence of St John of the Cross is derived entirely from contemporary copies, all the autographs having been destroyed; with St Teresa the case is far happier since her own MSS of her principal works have been carefully preserved, largely owing to the wise care of Philip II. The evidence is therefore exceptionally good, though the large number of emendations makes its interpretation a matter of some difficulty in places, and owing to the careful work of her latest editors we now know what she actually wrote.

An accurate text is the first essential to a sound translation, but even with a perfect text a *traduttore* may still, with the best intentions,

a *traditore* to his author's meaning. Especially may this be so with colloquial and elliptical a writer as St Teresa, and Prof. Peers encountered unexpected difficulties in translating her, for, as he remarks, much of her work "is autobiographical narrative, and, even in that part of it which is not, every page bears the indelible impress of her forceful and vivid personality. In addition to the difficulty of interpreting that personality by means of a translation there are stylistic difficulties of a kind presented by few, if any, other Spanish writers of the first rank. . . . Even Spaniards familiar with her books are continually baffled when asked the precise meaning of phrases which at first sight may seem perfectly simple. Vivid, disjointed, elliptical, paradoxical and gaily ungrammatical, the nun of Avila continually confounds those learned men to whom in her life she turned so often for enlightenment. One often has frankly to guess at her exact meaning, and half a dozen people may make half a dozen different guesses, none of which anybody can pick out as definitely correct."

The success with which Prof. Peers has overcome his formidable difficulties will be evident to every reader. He has not sought to tame the exuberance of the saint or to convert her nervous Spanish into stound English phrases; everywhere one finds oneself in touch with her personality and recognizes the authentic accents of her voice. Hispanists will, no doubt, argue indefinitely about the validity of his "guesses," but he gives the unlearned Englishman the opportunity of judging the more important of them by adding a literal translation in a footnote. As a test of his technical accuracy I would suggest a comparison of the description of the "third water" (*Life*, xvi, 4) in the present edition with the version of Lewis. Lewis is unfortunate here in his use of the words "disorder" and "restlessness"; Peers is right.

Prof. Peers' treatment of the *Way of Perfection* is a great advance on the Benedictine edition. There are two autograph MSS of this book: the Escorial, which is its original form, and the Valladolid, which is the saint's final revision. Obviously Valladolid must be printed, nevertheless there is much in Escorial which would only be abandoned with great loss. The Benedictine edition gives us a conflate text with no indication of which MS we are reading at any particular point; Prof. Peers gives us Valladolid complete with all the additions and omissions of Escorial clearly indicated. "The system I have adopted," he says, "not only assures the reader that he will be reading everything that St Teresa wrote and nothing that she did not write, but he can discern, almost at a glance, what she meant to be read by her little group of nuns at St Joseph's and also how she intended her work to appear in its more definitive form. Thus we can see her as the companion and Mother and as the writer and Foundress. In both rôles she is equally the Saint."

Not the least valuable feature of the present edition is its compendious indexes, which, combined with those in Prof. Peers' edition of St John of the Cross, give invaluable aid to the study of the teaching of these writers.

This edition should be in the hands of all serious students of spirit-

uality and all lovers of St Teresa, and it is to be hoped that Prof. Peers will not long delay his promised edition of the *Letters*.

F. P. HARTON.

BAULKING.

CHRIST, THE CHRISTIAN AND THE CHURCH. By E. L. Mascall. Longmans. 15s.

HIS BODY THE CHURCH. By W. Norman Pittenger. Morehouse-Gorham Co., New York. $2.50.

These books from different provinces of the Anglican Communion afford further evidence that the doctrine of the Church is one of the central concerns of theology to-day. The same conclusion could be drawn from recent works by Roman Catholic and Free Church writers, while Orthodox theologians have given their own distinctive contribution and perhaps have done more than is usually realized to bring about this "reunion" of theological concern. The fact that scholars of all parts of divided Christendom are concentrating on the nature and meaning of the "Una Sancta" is more likely to lead to true reunion than many more publicized happenings.

Mascall writes as a theologian for theologians. His book is fully and carefully documented, his thoughts are closely packed, his treatment somewhat technical. This is not a production that he who runs may read, but we have no right to expect that of "a study of the Incarnation and its consequences." The subject demands such serious treatment as is here given it, but it is a pity that the first few chapters are by far the hardest. Many readers will be glad to know that the going becomes easier and more straightforward when Chapter IV has been passed.

The first section concerns the Incarnation, viewed primarily as "the taking up of manhood into God." Mascall is convinced that the line of Christological thought from Gore through Weston to Relton cannot satisfy those who hold the belief of Chalcedon. The reason is not that these writers were heretical but that they were more influenced than they realized by the basically non-Christian intellectual climate of their age. They did great service, but we cannot be happy with many of their explanations, which seem to explain away vital elements of the Catholic doctrine of the Incarnation. Our attention is directed to the Christological sections of the *Ecclesiastical Polity* and to the writings of Archdeacon R. I. Wilberforce, whose book on the Incarnation appeared first in 1847. This is certainly worth study in its centenary year, and copies may be picked up in the dark and dusty little bookshops that so surprisingly resist our age of planning. But we should like our author to give a systematic treatment of Christology along the line that he himself thinks most adequate. In the present volume there is no scope for this, but we are given several hints that make us long for more. The short chapter on Incarnation and Atonement is a case in point. We believe that P. T. Forsyth was right when he wrote, "Christ's work is the master

y to His person, His benefits interpret His nature" (*The Person d Place of Jesus Christ*, p. 6).

The second part of Mascall's book deals with the fact of the carnation as the essential foundation of the life of the Christian. he keynote is incorporation into Christ: "the act by which God akes a man into a Christian is incorporation into the human nature Christ, an incorporation by which the very life of the Man Christ sus is communicated to us and we are re-created in him" (p. 77). his incorporation is seen to be the basis of the Church and the condition of all Christian worship, prayer, and theology. The apters dealing with these subjects are a rich synthesis of doctrinal d ascetic theology. They should prove specially illuminating to y who still believe that the Catholic religion in general (and atholic mysticism in particular) is "an attempt of man, in defiance the divine transcendence and of his own creatureliness, to climb to God."

The contrast presented by Pittenger's book is most intriguing. ere also is a member of the Anglican communion, THEOLOGY's litorial representative in the U.S.A., who would whole-heartedly mbrace the name of Catholic. Here again the doctrine of the Church the mystical Body of Christ is the central theme. But one wonders hat attitude Pittenger would adopt to two of the works so warmly mmended by Mascall: R. I. Wilberforce's *The Doctrine of the carnation* and Bishop Christopher Wordsworth's *Commentary on the ible*. Will he be able to find them on the library shelves of the General heological Seminary, New York, of which he is Fellow and Tutor? e suspect that, even if they are there, they will be somewhat dusty. he issue is raised of the attitude to the theological work of the last undred years. Pittenger would own his deep debt to it and he als with the Bible and the formularies of the faith in a reverent but nti-fundamentalist manner. Mascall quotes extensively from modern oman Catholic authors and perhaps sometimes gives the impression at the Vatican's Biblical Commission must be accepted by Anglicans they wish to drink so deeply from Roman sources. Oxford is much earer the Continent of Europe than is New York!

His Body the Church is based upon public lectures delivered in 1945 nder the auspices of the John Bohlen Trust. The book is a beautifully ear and orderly presentation of the Catholic doctrine of the Church. ere is a gifted teacher who can be at once accurate and intelligible. here is a solid foundation of sound learning, but we wish the references ere considerably fuller. The one subject which we thought was not early dealt with was the relationship between doctrine and faith. ould not the adoption of Dr V. A. Demant's distinction between gma and doctrine (in *The Religious Prospect*) be an advantage here? or are we convinced that it is worth while including two pages on e Papal claims if any adequate treatment is impossible on grounds f space. The works of such contemporary Roman scholars as Congar nd Mersch make it clear that the Papacy is an integral part of their octrine of the Church and that it calls for thorough theological reatment by those who do not accept it.

No one is likely to regret spending the time necessary for reading *His Body the Church*. Parish priests and others who exercise a teaching ministry will be grateful especially for the fresh treatment of the "marks" of the Church and for the chapters on her Worship, Faith, and Consummation.

NORMAN BLOW.

OXTON, BIRKENHEAD.

THE PROGRESS OF THE JESUITS (1556-79). By James Brodrick, S.J. Longmans. 16s.

This is a golden book. How rarely can one honestly apply that epithet; yet in this case it cannot be denied. Fr Brodrick's work, a companion volume to his *Origin of the Jesuits*, published in 1940, is gold, not only because it has been mined direct from the most authentic sources—the huge collection of original Jesuit letters and papers contained in the sixty-odd volumes of the *Monumenta Historica Societatis Jesu*—but because it possesses something of the delicacy of the goldsmith's art, the sheen as of old gold and the restful effect of perfect craftsmanship. This is achieved partly by translation of the sources which makes them read like originals, partly by a limpid and polished style, partly by a technique which with masterful artistry weaves together the many strands of dispersed Jesuit activity at this time into a narrative which holds the reader's attention throughout, covers the ground with singular completeness and yet hides the seams to such effect that one is barely conscious of the transitions as the author passes (almost literally in this case) from China to Peru. If Fr Brodrick ever wished to supplement his Order's income he could earn good money as a film cutter and assembler.

The years which form the subject of this book are the vital ones between the death of St Ignatius and the close of the Generalship of Fr Mercurian, thus comprising the days of the last named and his two predecessors, St Francis Borgia and Laynez, as rulers of the Society. It was a critical age. Fr Brodrick shows us the strain imposed upon the still young Order by the loss of its founder and nursing father, which showed itself in the disputes and jealousies accompanying the accession of Laynez, and needing all the tact and self-abnegation of that attractive figure to allay. But the storm, which scarcely overflowed the central teacup, was weathered, and the Society of Jesus prospered in a period when rapid expansion in all parts of the world was the order of the day and the problem which oppressed the directors of the Order was man-power sufficient to answer the increasing calls upon them and to make up for the wastage caused by martyrdoms in the mission field, casualties in travel and premature deaths through overwork. It is the picture of the varied activities of Jesuit fathers, from scholarship to remote missionary exploration, in all parts of the world which forms the theme of Fr Brodrick's book.

It is impossible to epitomize such a story, which must be read in full. Let it suffice to say that the reader will find many things to surprise and interest him—for example, the violent anti-Jewish prejudice,

ial rather than religious, which inspired all Spaniards of the day d made the Jesuit readiness to admit men of every race an obstacle to ir peaceful progress in Spain and a scandal to some of the Spanish hers. The purblind obstinacy of the Sorbonne, in repeating its itude towards the Friars and refusing to admit the Jesuits to teach, kes amusing, if sad, reading and enables one better to appreciate satires of Rabelais upon that august body. Throughout one is ertained by the dry comments of the author, who shares that wd and tolerant knowledge of human nature characteristic of English Jesuits; for Fr Brodrick makes his own the resolution of predecessor Sacchini, whom he quotes, never to hide the faults of brethren or of others. Remarks such as "He [Paul IV] might y the hatchet for a time, but he gave the impression of always fully marking the spot" (p. 4) are sheer joy. We have noticed y a few slips. Salmeron appears as "Salermon" on p. 263, and we k that the mention of *tigers* as well as lions in Ethiopia (p. 250) picturesque rather than zoologically accurate.

THOMAS M. PARKER.

PUSEY HOUSE,
OXFORD.

ELANDIC CHURCH SAGA. By John C. F. Hood. S.P.C.K. 16s.

During the war years, every now and then in the pleasant little broom that gives on to the Sjømannskirke at Rotherhithe, one uld hear through the lilt of Norse the sound of a harsher, more gged speech. It was some Icelander, come to eat smørbrød, chat h the pastor, and safeguard himself from the temptations awaiting ple sailors by handing over his pay to the Savings Bank.

Piety, like the other virtues bred in this sternest of lands, is simple, ditional and highly intelligent. The Icelanders, as Dr Hood observes, ve as high a standard of general education as anyone in Europe. is full and well-documented account of the Church in Iceland, by e chief Chaplain of the British Force of Occupation 1940-43, is propriately named a Saga, for the story of Christianity's thousand ars in Iceland is largely the story of her Bishops. "Iceland is an tensely individualistic country and the problems of its Church and mmonwealth, largely the product of isolation and harsh natural nditions, have been personal in their essence and in their treatment" p. 83).

Although there were Culdees in Iceland before the Norsemen came, ristianity was formally introduced about seventy years after the tlement, in the year 1000, by emissaries of Olaf Tryggvason. The xt two hundred years are the golden period of Icelandic history, e age of the great eddas and sagas. The two dioceses of Skálholt the south and Hólar in the north had each its Bishop-saint, St Jón Hólar and St Tholak of Skálholt, though with truly characteristic lf-sufficiency the "canonization" in each case was referred not to e Pope but to the Althing! The Icelandic clergy were equally different to pronouncements on celibacy, and the majority were

married, the succession often continuing in the same family. Their personal influence, unchallenged by that of any secular ruler, was so great that the mere arrival of a Bishop at the Thing was sufficient to compose differences, and in the days of the great Magnus there was hardly a weapon to be seen in the island.

In visiting their people, establishing churches and choir schools, encouraging learning, collecting the history of the island, codifying its ecclesiastical law, the clergy faithfully led their flocks and fulfilled the duties of temporal as well as spiritual rulers. The gradual rising of family feuds, in which the Bishops too became involved, ruined the old way of life till, largely owing to the ravages of Bishop Gudmund Arason (1202-37), who maintained what he considered to be his rights by the power of the sword, the Archbishop of Nidaros (Trondheim) put in Norwegian bishops, and shortly after the whole island fell under the secular dominion of Norway.

Norway's warrior bishops were of hardly less spirit than their predecessors, and Jón Arason, who resisted the introduction of Lutheranism in the Northern diocese, went so far as to imprison his brother bishop in an island monastery at the uncongenial task of drying stock fish. This Jón, a poet, a wit and something of a military genius, was beheaded by Danish officials, together with his two sons, Denmark having absorbed the Norwegian kingdom.

The seventeenth and eighteenth centuries are the darkest period in Icelandic history, but in these ages of disaster the Church recovered some of its ancient glory. Frightful earthquakes which destroyed whole districts and left thousands to perish of hunger and disease were less afflicting than the economic exactions of the Danish rulers, who ruthlessly exploited the wretched islanders. At the end of the eighteenth century the population was less than it had been at the time of Bishop Gizur's census in 1100—*i.e.*, *circa* 50,000. But throughout this grim time the devoted church leaders supported their people, and the hymns of the leper priest Hallgrimur Pétursson, and the *Family Sermons* of Bishop Jón Vidalin enabled family worship to continue even when public worship was impossible. It was a poor return for such service when the two seven-hundred-year-old sees were merged and the ancient traditions of Hólar and Skálholt obliterated by Danish church reformers.

In the happier period that has now culminated in the independence of Iceland, the pastors also played their part, and Dr Hood concludes his account with an acknowledgment of their generous hospitality to our forces. The working fellowship which ensued is a tribute to both parties and a welcome illustration of the kind of co-operation advocated by the Archbishop of Canterbury in a recent sermon at Cambridge. Dr Hood hopes that his book may help to maintain this fellowship, by making the facts generally available.

The story of the Church in Iceland is the story of an outpost, where the power of a strong fighter in what one Bishop called "God's Battle" gave him almost unlimited powers, but where weakness and mediocrity could find little tolerance. (A typical Icelandic understatement describes priestly offices as held "by God's tolerance.") In these

olarly but highly readable pages Dr Hood has produced a close-cked summary of Iceland's ecclesiastical story, told with skill and asional touches of unobtrusive humour. Dr Hood wears his learning ntly: he has not been rigid in transliteration, nor has he overburdened text with references, but there is an excellent critical apparatus, luding map, bibliography, chronological table, and a remarkably l and well-arranged index, which is a necessity to a work of this kind.

Girton College, Cambridge. M. C. Bradbrook.

---

ould Democracy Survive? By Various Writers. Dobson. 7s. 6d.

ie Church and Humanity (1939-1946). By G. K. A. Bell, Bishop of Chichester. Longmans. 8s. 6d.

The publisher's blurb printed inside the dust-cover of the former of se books appears to suggest that a number of writers, some of m highly distinguished, have collaborated to produce it. But s is not the case. Four of the essays are reprinted from various rnals, and the volume as a whole hardly bears the marks of unity. judge that it was produced primarily for American readers familiar with the debt which the democratic idea owes to Christian piration. The Master of Balliol, in what is perhaps the best essay the book, emphasizes the important distinction between the ientific," atomistic individualism of Descartes and Hobbes and ir successors, and the religious individualism of the leftist Puritan cts, to whom "the rôle of the state was to provide order and security which the free, creative, divine life of the Church, or rather of the urches, could go on. The state is thought of as a hedge or fence to otect the live, growing points of society which are in its religious e." There is little in common between democracy inspired by this e of liberalism, and the totalitarian democracy exemplified in ntemporary Russia and in the Welfare State towards which we are ving in this country: the "democracy" which conceives of the mmunity as a number of isolated and unrelated individuals con-nted with the only real association—the state. The deification the individual has culminated, in short, in political systems which at him as a cog or cipher, whose personality, shorn of rights and ivileges, is comprised by his political obligations. Mr Walter Lippman illiantly summarizes a widespread uneasiness about the prevailing sumptions of American educationists. The school and the university, maintains, having abandoned any idea of being concerned to ransmit the civilized tradition of the West," are becoming "mere ining grounds for personal careers . . . by separating education m the classical religious tradition, the school cannot train the pil to look upon himself as an inviolable person because he is ade in the image of God: these very words, though they are the oblest words in our language, now sound archaic." This essay ould be read in conjunction with a recent broadcast to similar effect Dr Hutchins, President of Chicago University; and, for the problem it affects this country, with the important series of "University

Pamphlets" (notably the two by Prof. H. A. Hodges) published by the S.C.M. Press.

The Bishop of Chichester's war-time speeches, delivered in the House of Lords and elsewhere, are good evidence, not only of the moral courage which makes him so greatly and widely respected even in circles which have little sympathy with his opinions, but of the extent to which the true democratic idea persists in this country. As spokesman for a Gospel which is "relevant to the whole of human conduct," the Bishop rightly rejects the suggestion that Christians must keep out of politics: "how can the entry of the Church into politics be avoided without a betrayal of the Church's faith?" In one of the best, as well as one of the most controversial, of these speeches he "challenges the Government on the policy which directs the bombing of enemy towns on the present scale"—and this in 1944, he and the Government well knowing that every word he spoke would be broadcast throughout Germany within a few hours! (The Bishop had a better case in this speech than when, in December, 1939, he sought to persuade the House of Lords that the situation then existing afforded all the guarantees—"positive, ascertainable, concrete and real guarantees"—necessary for entering upon negotiations for peace.) The issue raised by "obliteration" or "area" bombing is that "of power unlimited and exclusive"; and the heart of the argument against it is that it utterly rejects "the fair balance" which ought to exist "between the means employed and the purpose achieved." The Bishop was speaking before the advent of the atom bomb, but the relevance of his remarks to the new weapon, which raises the same problems in an even more acute form, is obvious enough. Looking back after the event, it is clear that several years of war had so far impaired our *morale* that by 1944 we were prepared to approve, or at least to tolerate, methods of warfare which—is it too much to say?—would have seared the conscience of the nation if they had been adopted in 1939. And what tortures the souls of many men and women to-day is the certainty that all future war will be atomic war, since they reject as fantastic wishful thinking any notion that the clock can be put back, and nations which possess atomic bombs and similar weapons be induced to forgo the use of them. So what—for the Christian who has hitherto regarded pacifism as a heresy?

C. E. Hudson.

St Albans.

Le Mystère Primordial. By Fr Taymans d'Eypernon, S.J. L'Edition Universelle, Bruxelles. Desclée de Brouwer, Paris. n.p.

To preserve the due proportion of the Faith is a primary concern of the theologian, and Fr d'Eypernon worthily fulfils his theological duty in this study of the Holy Trinity. He finds among Christians much sincere devotion toward Jesus Christ (expressing itself among his own people in frequent communion and devotion to the Sacred Heart); but with this Christocentric piety there appears the idea that belief in the Trinity is only another burden to be borne, even "une

centation plus subtile que les autres . . . pour éprouver la fidélité à croire envers et contre toutes les évidences." Yet intelligent devotion to the divine Lord ought to produce a correspondingly deep knowledge and love of the Holy Trinity. So this book, a careful and thorough exposition of the fundamental trinitarian dogma, seeks to show how this dogma pervades and illuminates the whole range of Christian thought and life. Its purpose is not to prove its truth from Scripture or to defend its rationality but rather "ce qu'il faut aujourd'hui, c'est rendre tout proche de la vie, que disons-nous? mettre dans la vie même, le Père, le Fils et l'Esprit Saint."

The data of Revelation are first surveyed. Then there are some comments on the explanations attempted by the Fathers and the scholastic theologians. The main body of the work then explores the meaning of the Trinity, "prenant pour centre de perspective la société humaine, où converge tout l'univers," and seeks to discover therein "une expression de la société divine, de la vie personelle de Dieu et des relations qui unissent, en les distinguant, le Père, le Fils et le Saint-Esprit." Outstanding features of the discussion are an impressive study of the divine Persons, various illuminating passages on the personality of the Holy Spirit and some penetrating remarks on the action of Father, Son and Spirit in a "mouvement trinitaire" in the work of man's salvation. It is then shown how the mystery of the Trinity is not one mystery among the others but that which all the others express and explain, because in one way or another they participate in it.

In a chapter entitled "Images et Vestiges" there is a subtle and eloquent argument on the trinity of relations manifested in Nature. The universe has its trinitarian pattern, not quite so obvious as some familiar traditional analogies make out, but real nevertheless. "L'univers est un immense agent et un merveilleux patient. Il est aussi une puissance d'équilibre, une harmonie sans cesse rétablie entre les forces génératrices et les forces réceptrices . . . Cette triple relation constitutive de tout le réel nous semble offrir une très fidèle image de la Sainte Trinité . . . La création entière est un poème admirablement rythmé, où chaque lettre, comme le poème dans son ensemble, répète à sa manière le mystère primordial."

This is a book to put side by side with Dr Prestige's *God in Patristic Thought* and Dr Hodgson's *The Doctrine of the Trinity*; and, in passing, it may be said that those who are not satisfied with Dr Hodgson's treatment of the *principium* of the Father will find here some fortifying reflexions on that subject. Perhaps the greatest merit of the book is its theological realism, its firm grasp of the truth that life must be theologically understood and that theology must retain the closest contact with the fundamental problems of man's moral and social life.

In its realization of the intimate union between theology and the spiritual life of the Christian this work frequently reminds us of the teaching of another eminent Belgian theologian, the late Abbot Marmion. That fact is itself a commendation.

H. Balmforth.
Ely.

THE OLD TESTAMENT AND THE FUTURE LIFE. By Edmund F. Sutcliffe, S.J. Burns Oates and Washbourne. 16s.

Fr Sutcliffe has given us an important study of the development of the Old Testament teaching on the future life, with introductory chapters on Egyptian and Babylonian ideas on the subject, and a concluding chapter on the teaching of the extra-canonical books—*i.e.*, books not recognized as canonical by the Council of Trent. The primary interest of the work, as its title indicates, is in the Old Testament, and only very brief summaries of the teaching of the other literature dealt with are offered. Throughout the author shows an independence of judgment that will make his book valuable to those who may not agree with him at all points, and it will command the attention of the scholar as well as of the general reader who desires to be instructed on these matters. Frequently he challenges the views of earlier workers in this field, including Charles, whose work is best known to English readers, and while he adopts a generally conservative position he does not approach the evidence with a closed mind. He criticizes Jerome for imposing his own views on his rendering of the Old Testament, and at several points rejects his interpretation for one less conservative than many critical scholars have adopted. Thus, he finds no suggestion of a momentary perception of the possibility of the resurrection in Job xix, 25-27, and holds that the resurrection of Isa. xxvi, 19 is national and not individual. Similarly he denies that Ps. lxxii, 24-28 contains any teaching about the after life.

The author recognizes that while there was quite early a belief in human survival after death, there was no clear formulation of a view on the rewards and punishments of that life, or on the resurrection, until a later period. He observes that "God Almighty has given man an intellect and He does not necessarily make a direct revelation of what the human mind can attain to by its own powers, or at least may wait for the soil to be prepared by human reflection before giving the seal of revelation" (p. 21). This is soundly said, and it means that not everything in the teaching of the Old Testament is dogmatically authoritative. It may be a part of the pre-revelation process of preparation by human reflection, and it must therefore be tested by something outside itself. Thus 4 Ezra (2 Esdras) is said to introduce an "erroneous notion"—though here the error would appear to be post-revelational in Fr Sutcliffe's view. On the other hand, however, "the highest dogmatic value" is attributed to the teaching of 2 Maccabees that looks to the doctrine of Purgatory "on account of the inspiration and canonicity of the book." This does not seem to the reviewer quite cogent. If canonicity does not guarantee authority in one place, it cannot alone guarantee it in another.

The first positive teaching on the resurrection of the body[1] is found

[1] C. M. Edsman has recently published a study on "The Body and Eternal Life" in *Horæ Sœderblomianæ*, I. *Mélanges Johs. Pedersen*, Fasc. II, 1946. The same writer has published two instalments of an incomplete treatment in Swedish of the replies of

in Dan. xii, 2, in a passage which Fr Sutcliffe finds to deal with the period of Antiochus Epiphanes. In treating of Isa. xxvi, 19 he observes that the idea of a resurrection would be an anachronism in Isaiah, but in dealing with Daniel he suggests that the teaching was far in advance of the writer's time, so that its significance was not perceived until the Maccabean age. Fr Sutcliffe notes that it is rather striking that it was just in this age that opposition to the doctrine first appeared, but does not accept the view that it was in this age that it was formulated. It seems to the reviewer more natural to ascribe the formulation in the Book of Daniel to that age than to find here an anachronism in this way.

Appreciation for the excellence of the work, however, far outweighs such measure of criticism as the reviewer would offer. It is impossible here to note all the valuable discussions on particular questions that are found in the book. The hermeneutical principle of compenetration is clearly set forth (pp. 141 *ff.*), and the question of collective retribution is well, though very succinctly, treated (pp. 83*f.*). There are many good translations of important passages, especially from the Psalter, followed by judicious textual notes. In Chapter VII the principle of relativity in the interpretation of what appear to be absolute statements in Scripture is well expounded, though some of the applications appear to the reviewer to lie beyond the legitimate application of the principle. Fr Sutcliffe defends the rendering "corruption" for the Hebrew *shachath* in some of its occurrences, against the *Oxford Hebrew Lexicon* (pp. 77*f.*). In these and a number of other places he offers valuable contributions on disputed questions, and they will add to the reader's indebtedness to the author for this book.

H. H. Rowley.

Manchester.

Henry Wheeler Robinson. A Memoir by Ernest A. Payne, with seven unpublished lectures by Dr Wheeler Robinson. Nisbet. 12s. 6d.

The Senior Tutor of Regent's Park College, the founding and shaping of which was the main preoccupation and great achievement of Wheeler Robinson's later years, has in this volume given an account of the life and work of its Principal which Wheeler Robinson's many friends will appreciate greatly. It is careful and very detailed, giving a picture of the training and development of one who was not only a fine and sincere Christian but a very great scholar.

Wheeler Robinson was always first and foremost a Christian. A loyal and sincere Baptist, he brought to his own traditional beliefs and loyalties a width of understanding which made both his devotion and his learning a possession of all the Churches. But his main work was given to the development of the theological and pastoral training of the Baptist ministry. With this always in view he made himself

---

the Greek and Latin Fathers to counter-arguments advanced against the doctrine : " Uppståndelsetron : Ett motargument och dess historia," in *Svensk Exegetisk Årsbok* ix, 1944, pp. 69-102, xi, 1946, pp. 5-46.

a scholar of real eminence in Old Testament studies, especially in their psychological and theological aspects, while he was so widely read in every other department of theological learning that he was, at the least, fully competent to meet the experts upon their own ground. There have of recent years been few men who could examine in every subject set in the Oxford Honours School of Theology with equal facility, and his passing is a great loss to Oxford scholarship.

Those who knew him best as a scholar will be very glad to have Mr Payne's full account of the background against which that scholarship was shaped. The story of Wheeler Robinson's life is a story of the Free Churches and of the great contribution which they have made, upon their own characteristic lines, to theological learning during the past half-century. The coming to Oxford of Mansfield College, Manchester College, and now of Regent's Park College, has already had consequences of very great significance in the life and working of the ancient Faculty of Theology there. The fact that in these Colleges theology has been strictly linked with training for the ministry and has therefore been forced to maintain comprehensiveness and breadth has been an invaluable corrective to the narrowing tendencies of pure scholarship. Here the part played in recent years by Wheeler Robinson has been of outstanding importance.

It was a happy thought which made Mr Payne include some of Wheeler Robinson's unpublished essays to complete the picture of his life, and a still happier one which placed in their forefront the singularly beautiful and sympathetic study of Cardinal Newman. That such an understanding appreciation should come from the pen of a Free Churchman is indeed a sign of the times, an augury of a coming together of Christians in a spirit which might, in the end, almost make the coming together of the Churches seem a secondary affair.

With its directness of pose and its background of books the picture is a most successful record alike of his purposeful and tenacious personality and of the broad scholarship which it put to such good use. The book is pleasantly printed and easy to read, and the admirable portrait of Wheeler Robinson by James Gunn is well reproduced as a frontispiece.

L. W. Grensted.

Oxford.

The Christian Minister in India. By C. W. Ranson. Lutterworth Press. 8s. 6d.

India is very much in the news to-day and the opportunities and responsibilities of the Christian Church are likely to be enhanced as India progresses to self-government.

This interesting and well-written book is the result of a survey on theological education in India made under the auspices of the National Christian Council. It was hoped that Bishop Neill of Tinnevelly might collaborate in the Report, but ill-health took him away from India.

What follows is a very comprehensive survey of the whole field. There are three main centres of theological training: the College at Serampore, which was originally chartered to confer degrees by the King of Denmark; the Anglican Bishops' College, Calcutta; and the United Theological College at Bangalore. The other institutions are for the most part denominational Bible schools and "seminaries" which conduct their studies in the language of the province.

The book contains some valuable material on the training of the clergy in the ancient Syrian Church of South India, the Roman Catholic method of training, and modern developments. Thought is given to the needs of the Indian Church as it actually is to-day. The problem of recruitment and finance is faced squarely, and after a careful study of existing facilities the conclusion is reached that the standard of education and training is very far from being what it should be and that a well-trained ministry must be a high if not the highest priority in the future plans of the Church in India. There is especial need for theological research, much more translation of literature, as well as an informed study by Christians of the non-Christian faiths of India. Nothing will be achieved without both concentration and co-operation. Co-operation in theological education provides material for what is perhaps the most concrete and illuminating section of the book. The type of development envisaged is the pooling of resources, a common library, lecturers, etc., with denominational halls; the Selly Oak Colleges at Birmingham are cited as an example to be followed.

After reading this book with profit there is one warning that must be given. Is the Indian minister to be a pale replica of the clergyman of the West, Roman collar and all? The institutions mentioned in this book are all akin to similar institutions in the West, but the Church must experiment. The ancient Ashram of India may provide a suggestive model. Christianity in India must grow out of the soil and develop its own distinctive contribution. One may be allowed to wonder whether any Anglicized or Americanized institution can do this.

SPENNYMOOR. LEONARD M. SCHIFF.

SHORTER NOTICES

HIS WILL IS OUR PEACE. By Gerald Vann, O.P. Sheed and Ward. 3s.

A series of addresses (presumably given in retreat) on the Lord's Prayer. They are written very simply, but every line indicates, as anyone who knows Fr Vann's work would expect, an expert acquaintance with ascetical theology and a profound knowledge of the human heart. "Theocentricity" is the central *motif:* and indeed we cannot be reminded too often that (*e.g.*) our failure to love our neighbour is the consequence, not (as we suppose) of paying too little attention to him, but of leaving God out of our own lives: "We set ourselves up as lords of life in defiance of the will and truth of God. And what does that

mean? It means avarice: I want this, I want that, I'm going to use this and that as *I* think fit. And having tried to eliminate God, we soon find ourselves trying to eliminate our neighbour."

C. E. H.

DESPITE THE COLOUR BAR. By A. M. Pullen. S.C.M. Press. 4s. 6d.

This is a popular biography of George W. Carver, the most distinguished colleague of Booker Washington at Tuskegee. Carver was born a slave and from the age of ten he fended entirely for himself, earning his living at first chiefly by laundry work. By almost incredible perseverance he was able to get himself educated and become a most eminent agricultural botanist, whose work conferred great benefits not only on the negroes, but on the whole economy of the Southern States. Among innumerable other things his researches produced 118 different products from the sweet potato and not less than 300 from the pea-nut.

Carver had many and varied gifts: he was no mean artist. But primarily he was a man of God who devoted all his life—forty years of it at Tuskegee—in entire self-forgetfulness to the welfare of his people. The biography is most readable and avoids sentimentality; and it is very topical, for just such men are perhaps the greatest need of the Christian movement in Africa, and in India to-day, where many of the problems are exactly what he faced. Anyone who has seen anything of the uphill work of rural reconstruction and agricultural missions will appreciate the genius revealed by his success in making the agricultural department of Tuskegee a paying proposition from the very start.

C. S. MILFORD.

THIS IS OUR FAITH. By John Dow. Religious Education Press. 10s. 6d.

Dr Dow is a professor of New Testament at Toronto. His book is an exposition of the Christian faith according to the tenets of the United Church of Canada. It is a disappointing work. It might have been a useful reference book for all who wish to study contemporary Protestantism on the American continent and in particular the theological position of the United Church. Unhappily it consists of some 240 pages of sermonettes, written in a style so loaded with clichés and emotional rhetoric that the task of reading it is acutely uncomfortable. Nor is there much to raise the content above the commonplace. One can only wonder for what audience the book is intended.

H. B.

Printed in Great Britain by
Billing and Sons Ltd., Guildford and Esher